

**AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS**

The attached sheet of drawings includes changes to Figures and 11 and 12.

Attachment:      Replacement sheet

### **REMARKS**

Claims 1-7 and 9-12 are pending.

#### ***Foreign Priority***

The indication that the foreign priority documents have been received and placed in the file is noted.

#### ***Information Disclosure Statement***

The indication that the Information Disclosure Statements together with the documents filed on March 11, 2004 and October 5, 2004 have been considered is noted.

#### ***Reply to Objection to the Title***

The title has been amended. The Examiner is requested to approve the title change.

#### ***Drawings***

In section 1 of the Office Action on page 2, the Examiner objected to Figures 11 and 12 of the drawings. Accompanying this Reply is a replacement sheet adding the legend PRIOR ART for Figures 11 and 12.

With respect to the Examiner's comment regarding Figure 11 that the "pcb outline and rails should be shown", the change requested is not understood and the Examiner is requested to reconsider this requirement. Figure 11 is described, for example, in the paragraph bridging pages 3 and 4 of the specification. Figure 11 depicts prior art, and it is not clear why the Examiner is requesting changes to Figure 11 other than labeling the figure as prior art. Specifics of prior art are not required, only adequate drawings of the claimed invention are required. See MPEP Section 608.01(g) P600-79, right column, first full paragraph, last sentence.

***Objection to the Specification***

The Office Action asserted that page 19, line 1 was unclear. Line 1 on page 19 has been amended.

The Examiner is requested to reconsider and withdraw the objection to the specification.

***Reply to Rejections***

**First Rejection**

Claim 10 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention, see paragraph 4.

Claim 10 has been amended and now does comply with 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.

For the reasons set forth above, the Examiner is requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of the claim under 35 U.S.C. 112.

**Second Rejection**

Claims 1-9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Japan 2863981 alone or taken in view of Admitted Prior Art (APA). This rejection is traversed.

Initially, the claims have been amended to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter disclosed.

The ground terminal disclosed in Japanese Patent 2863981 (981) has a U-shaped end portion 23 projecting from one end edge of the terminal body. This end portion 23 is, however,

not a semicircular notch of the present invention in the context claimed. Namely, the end portion of Japanese Patent 981 does not contribute to the reduction of the size of the ground terminal as well as of the printed board as a whole. More specifically, the printed board is required to have an area large enough to span the whole of the U-shaped end portion 23. In this regard, according to the present invention, the semicircular notch formed in one end edge of the ground terminal serves as a receiving portion for receiving a mounting screw and does not lead to increase in size of the ground terminal or the printed board.

Further, the ground terminals of Japanese Patent 981 and APA each have a plurality of leads 24/1a. These leads 24/1a also project from the terminal body and thus do not correspond to the connection portions of the present invention in the context claimed. According to the present invention, the notch and the grooves are formed in the first and second end edges, respectively, of the ground terminal body. This ensures that the terminal has uniform mechanical strength over the entire body and serves to prevent the terminal body from being deformed in an undesirable manner when the ground terminal is mounted to the printed board.

The ground terminal disclosed in Japanese Patent Document 11-26040 also does not include elements corresponding to the notch and the connection portions of the present invention in the context claimed.

As each and every limitation is not disclosed either expressly or inherently, a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102 is not viable.

With respect to the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103, the Admitted Prior Art (APA) does not cure the innate deficiencies of a rejection based on the Japanese Patent Document 2863981.

With respect to the dependent claims, claims 2-7, and 9, these claims are considered patentable at least for the same reasons as their base claims. Additionally, as explained above, the combination claimed provides an unexpected result which must be considered before jumping to a conclusion of obviousness. This is set forth in the case of *The Gillette Co. v. S.C.*

*Johnson & Son, Inc.* 16 USPQ2d 1923, 1928 (Fed. Cir. 1990), wherein the Court stated as follows:

An analysis of obviousness of a claimed combination must include consideration of the results achieved by that combination. As we explained in *Interconnect Planning Corp. v. Feil*, 774 F.2d 1132, 1143, 227 USPQ 543, 551 (Fed. Cir. 1985): [cited in MPEP]

### Third Rejection

Claims 10-12 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over APA in view of Japan 2863981. This rejection is traversed. As explained above, the Japanese document 2863981 does not show or suggest the features claimed. Plus, the Japanese document does not cure the innate deficiencies of a rejection based on the APA, the APA was discussed *supra*.

For the reasons set forth above, the Examiner is requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103.

### *Comment*

In section 14 of the Office Action, the Examiner stated “in response applicant is asked to discuss, to extent known, uses of Japan figure 3 type terminal with respect to pcb, rails etc, as recited in claims 10, 11”. What is requested is not clear. The ground terminal of Figure 11 is the prior art set forth in the specification. For example, (see page 2, line 28). This document was submitted in Information Disclosure Statement of March 11, 2004, which the Examiner did consider.

For the reasons set forth above, the Examiner is requested to reconsider and withdraw the requirement sets forth in section 14 of the Office Action.

**CONCLUSION**

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: February 2, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Charles Gorenstein  
Registration No.: 29,271  
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP  
8110 Gatehouse Road  
Suite 100 East  
P.O. Box 747  
Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747  
(703) 205-8000  
Attorney for Applicant

Attachments: Replacement sheet of Figures 11 and 12